INSPECTION REPORT

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Facility Name:	Phillips66 Los Angeles Refinery Wilmington (P66W)
Facility Address:	1660 W Anaheim, Wilmington, California, 90744
Telephone Number:	(301) 952-6210
EPA ID Number:	CAD008237679
Facility Type:	Oil Refinery – Large quantity generator of Hazardous Waste (NAICS: 324110)
Type of Business:	Oil Refinery
Waste streams:	Contaminated soil, universal waste, oily debris, asbestos, sludge, waste paint, solvents, lead debris, spent catalysts, sandblast grit, oily rags, oily residues, aerosol paint cans, and various wastes associated to oil refinery operations
Regulated Units:	Post closure permit Stormwater Holding Basin No. 2 (SHB 2)
Regulatory Status:	Post Closure Permitted, Large Quantity Generator
Owner/Operator:	Phillips66 Company P.O Box 4428, Houston, Texas 77210
Facility Representative(s):	Cheryl Cobb (Waste Coordinator), John Matthews (Senior Environmental Engineer), Mike Bekel (Health and Safety Coordinator), Tony Avacoli (Business Team Lead)
Type of Inspection:	Compliance Evaluation Inspection (CEI)
Inspected By:	Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) LeeAnn Young, Lead (Environmental Scientist) Maria Durand (Senior Environmental Scientist)

TN:smk
TN04b.0716

Tiffany Nef (Environmental Scientist)

Date(s) of Inspection: March 22-23, 2016

II. CONSENT

Consent to conduct an inspection may include: inspecting hazardous waste handling areas, questioning personnel, taking photographs, collecting samples, and reviewing and copying documents.

Consent given by: John Matthews
Date and time: March 22, 2016, at 9:23 a.m.

III. BACKGROUND

The Phillips66 Los Angeles Refinery consists of two plants (Wilmington plant and Carson plant) that are connected by pipelines and together provide complete refinery facilities. Phillips66 was previously known as Unocal from 1919 till 1991, Union Oil Company till 1997, Tosco Corporation till 2001, and ConocoPhillips Company till 2012.

The Wilmington plant consists of a 424 acre parcel on which refining operations have been conducted since 1919. The facility is roughly square in shape and is bounded on the North by Anaheim Street. To the East, the facility is bounded by Gaffery Street. The Port of Los Angeles distribution center and the AmeriGas LPG storage facility borders the South side of the facility. And on the West of the facility, lies Harbor Freeway.

The Phillips66 Wilmington plant is a refining, processing, and storage facility that processes intermediate petroleum streams into finished products of automotive gasoline, jet fuel, and diesel. The petroleum streams are provided by pipeline from the Phillips66 Carson plant. The intermediates received from the Carson plant include naphtha distillates, diesel distillates, and gas oils.

The facility has eight principal processes: 1) naphtha hydro treating/reforming, 2) alkylation, 3) mid-barrel hydro treating, 4) gas oil hydro treating/hydrocracking and catalytic cracking, 5) sulfur production, 6) sulfuric acid production, 7) blending/shipping/storage, and 8) utilities. Utilities include steam/air, water, hydrocarbon relief and recovery systems, and electronic cogeneration.

Groundwater monitoring at the facility is conducted pursuant to Cleanup and Abatement Order (CAO) 94-139 issued to Union Oil Company on December 22,

1994 by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Los Angeles Region.

The Stormwater Holding Basin No. 2 (SHB 2) was placed under RCRA interim status in 1990 because of the RCRA TCLP rule that went into effect at that time. The rule states that any surface impoundment that handles refinery process water automatically becomes a RCRA-regulated surface water impoundment. The SHB 2 is used to provide emergency storage in the event that the storm water and or process wastewater storage capacity of the refinery is exceeded due to a catastrophic release, refinery wide power outage or rainfall during severe storms. Another purpose of the SHB 2 is to receive overflow process water from the Oil Recovery Unit (ORU).

The following are summaries of DTSC inspections conducted at P66W during the last 5 years:

June 26, 2013:
DTSC Environmental Scientist, Mr. Ignacio Dominguez, conducted a Compliance Evaluation Inspection at P66W and observed no issues of concern at the time of inspection. A Summary of Observations was issued at the end of the inspection.

IV. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

A. Manifests, Bills of Lading, LDR's and Inspection Reports:
The hazardous waste manifests from 2015-2016 were reviewed. No issues of concern were observed at the time of inspection.

B. Contingency Plan:
The contingency plan was reviewed and determined to have been up to date and complete. No issues of concern were observed at the time of inspection.

C. Training Plan and Records:
The training records of Hector Rivera, Francisco Figueroa, Raymundo Garcia, Socorro Hernandez, and Daniel Misa were reviewed. Training records on contractors are kept at the facility for three years. Brinderson Contracting Company provides the training to their employees to keep them in compliance with all hazardous waste regulations. At the time of inspection, P66W was unable to provide annual HAZWOPER training records before 2013 due to the change over from ConocoPhillips. Ms. Joyce Dehart (Hazardous Waste Supervisor) contacted Brinderson Contracting Company for the missing training records. After further review, the training records demonstrated that the contactors were properly trained to handle hazardous waste, and they were up to date on annual refresher trainings since 2013. No issues of concern were observed at the time of inspection.

D. Incident Report:
P66W said they had no incidents to report so there were no incident reports to review at the time of inspection.

E. Waste Analysis Plan and Records:
The waste analysis plan was reviewed. No issues of concern were observed at the time of inspection.

F. Operation Log:
The operation log was reviewed. No issues of concern were observed at the time of inspection.

G. Inspection Records:
The weekly inspection records of the Post Closure Storm Basin were reviewed. No issues of concern were observed at the time of inspection.

H. Annual/Biennial Reports:
The Biennial reports were reviewed. No issues of concern were observed at the time of inspection.

I. SB-14 Plans:
The SB-14 plan was reviewed. No issues of concern were observed at the time of inspection.

J. Closure Cost Estimates and Updates:
The 2015 Financial Assurance documents for liability coverage and closure/post-closure care were reviewed. P66W provided copies of the Financial Assurance documents. I submitted a financial review request to DTSC's Financial Review Unit in Sacramento, California. Upon completion of the review by the Financial Responsibility Unit, a separate report will be sent directly to the facility noting their findings.

K. Part A:
The Permit Part A was reviewed before DTSC scientists went to the facility.

L. Part B:
The Permit Part B was reviewed before DTSC scientists went to the facility.

M. Variances:
There were no variances to be reviewed at the time of inspection.

TN:smk
TN04b.0716

V. NARRATIVE OF OBSERVATIONS

Tuesday, March 22, 2016

On Tuesday, March 22, 2016, at 8:30 a.m., Ms. LeeAnn Young, Ms. Maria Durand, and I, Ms. Tiffany Nef, arrived at the P66W Refinery. We discussed our inspection plan, gathered our inspection gear and personal protective equipment (PPE), and checked in with security. We were directed to the Administration Building where we met with Mr. John Matthews (Senior Environmental Engineer), and Mr. Mike Bekel (Health and Safety Coordinator). While waiting to meet with Ms. Cheryl Cobb (Waste Coordinator), we watched the P66W Safety video. Once Ms. Cobb arrived, she and Mr. Matthews escorted us to the Manager's banquet room and began discussing our inspection plan.

Ms. Young explained we were there to conduct a Compliance Evaluation Inspection (CEI). Ms. Young asked Mr. Matthews for consent to conduct the inspection. Consent was given by Mr. Matthews at 9:23am, with the request, by Ms. Cobb, that she would take the photographs during the inspection and would give Ms. Young a CD copy of the photographs at the conclusion of the inspection. Ms. Young and Ms. Cobb agreed.

Ms. Young provided Ms. Cobb a list of documents we needed to review during the inspection. We agreed that Ms. Cobb would provide these documents by the end of the following day. We then discussed with Ms. Cobb and Mr. Matthews the areas of interest we wanted to inspect throughout the refinery.

Mr. Matthews gave an overview of the facility operations. At the conclusion of the overview, we began the facility walkthrough portion of the inspection. It was agreed to inspect the Stormwater Holding Basin Post Closure area (SHB 2), Acid Plant, Sulfur Plant, and Bundle Cleaning Pad before our lunch break. We were escorted by Mr. Matthews and Ms. Cobb the entire duration of the walkthrough.

Stormwater Holding Basin (Post Closure Area)

We started with inspecting the Stormwater Holding Basin No. 2 (SHB 2) located along the eastern boundary of the refinery in an area known as Block 6. The SHB 2 has surface dimensions of 436.75ft by 356.5ft and a depth at the deepest point of 34ft. We observed the basin to be empty. I observed a water pump beside the Northeast corner of the basin pumping out a puddle of rain water. From the west side where we were standing, we observed no rips or tears in the basin liner. I asked Mr. Matthews how P66W handles accumulated water in the basin and where the water goes. Mr. Matthews said they pump the water out of the basin and into the Oil Refinery Unit (ORU), which then goes to the process sewers and finally to the Publically Owned Treatment Works (POTW). He said they pump the

water this way because P66W does not treat the water. Ms. Cobb said P66W had applied for a treatment permit, but have not yet been approved for one. Ms. Cobb said temporary pumps are brought in during the fall, for the rain season, and would only sample the water if there was a release. At Ms. Young's request, Ms. Cobb took a photograph of the post closure basin, **(Attachment B1)**.

Ms. Young asked Ms. Cobb and Mr. Matthews to describe the inspection protocol for the SHB 2 liner. Ms. Cobb stated that the liner is inspected visually, daily. P66W does a close visual inspection semiannually, and a mechanical inspection every ten years. The daily inspections are electronically completed two times a day at the beginning of each 12 hour shift by P66W personnel. Ms. Young and I reviewed the daily inspection logs online. We asked to look at December 24, 2015 log to see if reports were done on holidays. We observed that the daily inspections were conducted seven days a week, 365 days a year. Upon further review, we observed one daily inspection report that answered yes to the question of "Were there any damages [to the liner?]". Ms. Young asked Ms. Cobb and Mr. Matthews what the follow up was when an employee notes damages to the liner. Ms. Cobb did not know the answer, but said she would find someone who would have knowledge of this process.

The following day, Wednesday, March 23, 2016, Ms. Cobb introduced us to Mr. Frank Quinn (Process Supervisor). Ms. Young asked Mr. Quinn about the daily inspection procedures pertaining to the post closure pond liner. Specifically, Ms. Young asked about P66W's follow up when tears and other issues are noted regarding the pond liner. Mr. Quinn said P66W does not have a specific protocol on writing down the follow up to any rips or tears in the lining, but that the appropriate follow-up and repairs are done. Ms. Cobb said she would look into ensuring a reporting system for follow-up was completed by employees within P66W's current daily inspection reports. DTSC scientists will follow up on what reporting procedures P66W has implemented.

No issues of concern were observed at the time of the inspection.

Acid Plant (Tiered Permitted area – Permit by Rule)

We proceeded to the Acid Plant. Any acidic liquid that enters the drain, within the secondary containment for this process area, would be routed to the acid neutralization unit. We first inspected Satellite Accumulation Area (SAA) #21. This area contained one 55-gallon metal drum labeled as hazardous waste containing contaminated PPE from unit 141, with a start accumulation date of 3/18/16. Next, we inspected SAA #20 and observed it to have one 55-gallon metal drum labeled as universal waste containing spent aerosol cans from unit 141, with a start accumulation date of 12/21/15. Both drums had closed tops and appeared to be structurally sound.

No issues of concern were observed at the time of the inspection.

Sulfur Plant

Following the Acid Plant, Mr. Matthews and Ms. Cobb escorted us to the Sulfur Plant. Mr. Matthews explained that the Sulfur Plant is the pretreatment area for selenium. Ms. Young asked where the process water from tanks number 461 and 462 within the Sulfur Plant drain to. Mr. Matthews said that the process water drains to the ORU.

We inspected two SAA 55-gallon drums. The first drum was labeled as universal waste containing spent aerosol cans from unit 138, with a start accumulation date of 2/19/16. The second 55-gallon drum was labeled as hazardous waste containing contaminated PPE from unit 138, with a start accumulation date of 2/19/16. Both drums had closed tops and appeared to be structurally sound.

I observed one, blue 55-gallon metal drum while inspecting the area. Ms. Young and Ms. Durand confirmed that the drum was a one bolt ring, sealed, not labeled, plastic lined drum with unknown contents. Ms. Cobb was unsure of the contents inside of the drum therefore Ms. Cobb went to ask the plant supervisor to provide us with the MSDS of the unlabeled blue drum. When Ms. Cobb returned from speaking with the plant supervisor, she informed us that information on the blue drum would be provided to us before the end of our inspection. P66W personnel did not know what waste was inside the drum, there was no hazardous waste label on the drum, and there was no start accumulation date indicated on the drum. A photograph of the drum was taken by Ms. Cobb, **(Attachment B2)**.

The following day, Wednesday, March 23, 2016, Ms. Young obtained a copy of the Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) and hazardous waste manifest of the drum from Ms. Dehart, **(Attachment C)**. The MSDS identified the contents to be refractory brick. The hazardous waste manifest described the refractory brick as Non-RCRA hazardous waste, solid, contaminated debris. Ms. Dehart informed Ms. Young that the drum had been shipped off that day.

P66W violated California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66262.11 for failing to determine if the waste in the blue drum is excluded from regulation either by testing the waste or by applying knowledge of the hazard characteristic of the waste in light of the materials or the processes used.

P66W violated California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66262.34(a) (3) for failing to mark or label the blue drum with a hazardous waste label.

P66W violated the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66262.34(a) (2) for failing to mark each container with the date upon which the contents in the blue drum had become a waste.

For reference to the three above stated violations, see the violation section VI in this inspection report or see the Summary of Violations, **(Attachment A)**.

Bundle Cleaning Pad

We proceeded to the bundle cleaning pad. Mr. Matthews explained that when a truck arrives at the bundle cleaning pad with a heat exchanging bundle, the bundle is inundated with sludge and solids. He said they pressure wash the bundles to remove the sludge and solids. They then put the sludge into drums and label the drums as KO5O–RCRA waste. This is the waste code for heat exchanger bundle cleaning sludge from petroleum refining industry operations. Mr. Matthews explained that the water used to wash down the bundles is gravity fed into the ORU, back into the process.

Ms. Cobb escorted Ms. Young to the back wall of the bundle cleaning pad where Ms. Young observed the wall to have deteriorating backsplash netting. Ms. Young told Ms. Cobb that the netting on the back of the pad needed to be replaced due to the deterioration and Ms. Cobb acknowledged that and told Ms. Young that a replacement had been ordered. Ms. Young and Ms. Cobb came back to the front of the cleaning pad where Ms. Cobb took a photo, **(Attachment B3)**. DTSC scientists discussed this issue with the facility representatives as an issue of concern.

For reference to this issue of concern, see the Discussion with Operator, Section VIII, of this inspection report.

We then took our lunch break at the P66W cafeteria. After our lunch break, Ms. Young, Ms. Durand, and I were escorted to the banquet room to review manifests and training record documents. After document review, we planned with Ms. Cobb and Mr. Matthews to inspect the Mechanic Garage, Loading Dock, Hazardous Waste Accumulation Area, Oil Recovery Unit (ORU), Mechanic Shop, and Grit Blasting Area.

Maintenance Area "Mechanic Garage"

Mr. Matthews and Ms. Cobb escorted us to the Hazardous Waste Pad office were we met Ms. Joyce Dehart (Hazardous Waste Supervisor). Ms. Dehart provided the manifests and training records Ms. Young had requested, and we reviewed them. Details of our review of these documents can be found in Section IV of this report.

After reviewing the manifests and training documents, we were escorted by Mr. Matthews, Ms. Cobb and Ms. Dehart to the Maintenance area "Mechanic Garage". We were introduced to Mr. Brady Hay (Automotive Mechanic). Mr. Hay

escorted us outside of the shop to SAAs #29 and #30. At SAA #29, I observed one white 55-gallon metal drum labeled as hazardous waste containing contaminated PPE, with a start accumulation date of 2/19/16. The drum was securely closed and appeared to be structurally sound, **(Attachment B4)**. At SAA #30, I observed a yellow 55-gallon plastic drum labeled as hazardous waste containing mechanic garage antifreeze, with a start accumulation date of 9/21/15. The drum was securely closed and showed no signs of leakage, **(Attachment B5)**.

Ms. Young and Ms. Durand observed used oil filters draining into a square oil tank. The storage tank was labeled as Excluded Recyclable Material (ERM) containing used oil. Mr. Hay explained to Ms. Young and Ms. Durand that after the oil filters are drained, the filters are placed in the blue 55-gallon metal drum labeled as drained used oil filters, which had a start accumulation date of 2/19/16.

No issues of concern were observed at the time of the inspection.

Loading Dock

Ms. Dehart, Mr. Matthews and Ms. Cobb then escorted us to the loading dock. I noted there were four roll off bins. Two of the bins were labeled as Bio-Slurry Reaction Process (BSRP) cake solids, with start accumulation dates of 3/15/16 and 3/24/16; one roll off bin was labeled as sludge vanadium toxic non RCRA solid, with a start accumulation date of 2/26/16; and the last roll off bin was labeled as solid hydrocarbon toxic non RCRA hazardous waste solid, with a start accumulation date of 2/17/16. The roll off bins were closed, showed no signs of leakage, and appeared to be structurally sound. Ms. Young asked Ms. Dehart when the bins would be picked up and Ms. Dehart said they would be ready to have the roll off bins shipped out on the morning of Wednesday, March 23, 2016. We then proceeded to the Hazardous Waste Accumulation Area.

No issues of concern were observed at the time of inspection.

Hazardous Waste Accumulation Area

Upon arriving at the hazardous waste accumulation area Ms. Young instructed me to test the emergency shower and eye wash station. Ms. Dehart gave me approval to test the station, and assured us no alarms would sound. I tested the eye wash first. When pressing the handle, water began to come up out of one of the spouts. The water did not produce enough pressure to remove the cap from the left spout, and therefore it did not have the crossover water formation required. Ms. Dehart told Ms. Young that she would have the eye washed looked at and fixed by tomorrow. I then tested the shower, and it worked properly.

P66W violated California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66265.34(a)(4) and 66265.33 for failing to assure proper operation of an emergency eye wash station.

For reference to this violation, see the violation section VI in this inspection report or see the Summary of Violations, **(Attachment A)**.

On Wednesday, March 23, 2016, P66W personnel repaired the emergency eyewash station and reported that carbon buildup was the cause of the problem. Ms. Young and I follow up inspected the emergency eye wash station and found it to be in proper working order.

Next, we observed several flow bins. Upon closer inspection, Ms. Durand and I counted 14 flow bins labeled as hazardous waste containing spent aluminum catalyst, with a start accumulation date of 2/1/16, and one flow bin labeled as hazardous waste containing sweepings of spent aluminum catalyst, with a start accumulation date of 2/1/16. We also observed one roll off bin labeled as hazardous waste containing double bagged asbestos, and one roll off bin labeled as hazardous waste containing spent insulation refinery wide waste with a start accumulation date of 1/26/16. We also observed one low boy recycling bin containing plastic and glass bottles. Next to the low boy, there were about 30 empty, blue colored metal and blue colored plastic 55-gallon drums neatly stacked. I noted that the majority of the pad space was taken up by 94 blue colored 55-gallon drums on 28 pallets. It varied from one to four drums on each pallet. All drums were ring and bolt sealed, labeled, had no signs of leakage, and appeared to be structurally sound. There was also good aisle spacing. No accumulation dates were over the 90 day mark.

We then proceeded to the Universal waste storage area, located in a shed with two roll up doors. Ms. Dehart rolled up the two doors for Ms. Young and I to inspect inside. The shed contained 20 properly managed lead acid batteries, set on wooden pallets, and properly labeled as universal waste. Ms. Young and I observed three 55-gallon metal drums labeled as universal waste containing spent aerosol cans, with start accumulation dates of 3/8/16, 2/5/16, and 1/26/16. We also observed one 55-gallon drum labeled as hazardous waste containing mercury bulbs, with a start accumulation date of 2/8/16. There were seven small plastic containers labeled as universal waste containing batteries (alkaline, lead, zinc, lithium, rechargeable), with start accumulation dates ranging from 12/19/15 to 3/3/16. Next to the batteries, were four tall cardboard drums labeled as universal waste containing florescent light bulbs, with a start accumulation date of 1/15/16. All containers were closed and appeared to be structurally sound.

I then proceeded to outside of the Universal waste storage area shed to SAA #27 where I observed one 55-gallon metal drum labeled as hazardous waste containing contaminated PPE, with a start accumulation date of 2/26/16. I then

observed SAA #28 to be one 55-gallon metal drum labeled as universal waste containing spent aerosol cans, with a start accumulation date of 2/26/16. Both drums were closed and appeared to be structurally sound.

Ms. Young inspected the fire extinguisher outside of the Universal waste storage shed and found that the inspection tags were up to date.

Oil Recovery Unit (ORU)

Next, Mr. Matthews and Ms. Cobb escorted us to the ORU. Mr. Matthews said this was where dissolved air flotation (DAF) and sludge were generated. Ms. Durand observed one 55-gallon metal drum in SAA#22. The drum was labeled as hazardous waste containing oily debris/solids from tank 198, with a start accumulation date of 1/8/16. Ms. Durand observed that the lid on the drum was not properly closed because the bolt securing the ring on the lid was not properly closed in place. Ms. Cobb unsuccessfully tried to close the drum herself. Ms. Cobb then asked an operator in the area to properly close it. The operator could not properly close it due to the screw being stripped.

P66W violated California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66265.173(a) for failing to properly close a hazardous waste container in SAA#22 that was labeled as hazardous waste containing oily debris/solids from tank 198 in ORU.

For reference to the violation, see the violation section VI in this inspection report or see the Summary of Violations, **(Attachment A)**.

On Wednesday, March 23, 2016 we observed the drum to have a new lever lid and securely closed. A photograph was taken of the closed lid on March 24, 2016, by Ms. Cobb, **(Attachment B6)**. Ms. Cobb asked Ms. Dehart to order a more convenient lever lid for the drum. A photograph was taken by Ms. Cobb on April 6, 2016 of the new lid, **(Attachment B7)**.

As we were walking back towards the ORU office, I observed a pile of unidentified trash that seemed to have been there for a while. I observed a bag of used PPE, a folded blue tarp, a non-legible labeled 2.5-gallon plastic jug containing an unknown metallic liquid, two white 5-gallon buckets with black lids containing unknown contents, and one open 5-gallon black bucket containing unknown contents. Ms. Young asked Ms. Cobb to take a photograph, **(Attachment B8)**.

Ms. Cobb went to the ORU office to ask for the operator, Mr. Abdec Lacanaria, about the unidentified pile of trash. Ms. Cobb brought Mr. Lacanaria to where the pile of trash was. Ms. Young asked if he knew where the trash originated from and Mr. Lacanaria said that it was, "obviously contractor trash". Ms. Young

explained to him that regardless of whose trash it was, it needed to be identified and moved to its correct location according to each items contents.

P66W violated California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66262.11 for failing to make to determination if waste is hazardous by exclusion from regulation, testing the waste according to acceptable methods, or applying knowledge of the hazard characteristic.

P66W violated California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66262.34(a) (3) for failing to mark or label each hazardous waste container used for onsite accumulation.

P66W violated California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66262.34(a) (2) for failing to mark each container with the date upon which the contents had become a waste.

For reference to the three above stated violations, see the violation section VI in this inspection report or see the Summary of Violations, **(Attachment A)**.

The next day, March 23, 2016, Ms. Dehart's crew removed the trash, cleaned the area where the trash had been, and put the trash into the roll off bin labeled as hazardous waste containing ongoing refinery cleanup for oily metals. On March 23, 2016 we observed the ORU area was in compliance. A photograph was taken by Ms. Cobb on March 24, 2016 of the area, **(Attachment B9)**.

Paint area "Mechanic Shop"

After leaving the ORU, we were escorted to the Paint area were we met Mr. Robert Negrete (Foreman Techno Coating contractor). Ms. Young asked Mr. Negrete to explain to us what his job entails how he handles hazardous waste. Mr. Negrete said he paints daily and does no sand blasting. Mr. Negrete explained to Ms. Young that he takes buckets of dried paint to the hazardous waste area, and would drop off other paint products in the SAA near the Valve Shop across the street. We observed air filters, the paint booth, and the paint cabinet containing paint thinners and other products used by Mr. Negrete.

Outside, in the back of the shop, I observed one 55-gallon metal SAA labeled as hazardous waste containing paint related material, with a start accumulation date of 1/8/16. The drum was closed, showed no signs of leakage, and appeared to be structurally sound. No issues of concern were observed at the time of the inspection.

Grit Blasting Area

We were escorted by Ms. Cobb to the Grit Blasting area where we found no operator to be present. Ms. Young observed two open 5-gallon plastic buckets containing 8 spent aerosol cans. The containers were not properly labeled, were not properly contained, and did not have a start accumulation date. Ms. Cobb picked up one aerosol can and confirmed that it was empty. We observed one other aerosol can to be missing its nozzle. Ms. Young had Ms. Cobb take pictures of the spent aerosol cans, **(Attachment B10, B11)**.

P66W violated the Health and Safety Code, Section 25201.16(f)(1)(A) in that on or about March 22, 2016, P66W failed to store universal waste – spent aerosol cans in a closed container.

P66W violated the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, and Section 66273.35(b) for failing to demonstrate the length of time the universal waste has been accumulated from the date it became a waste.

P66W violated the Health and Safety Code, Section 25201.16(f)(6) for failing to label a container used to hold universal waste with one of the following phrases: "Universal Waste – Aerosol Cans", "Waste Aerosol Cans", or "Used Aerosol Cans".

For reference to the two above stated violations, see the violation section VI in this inspection report or see the Summary of Violations, **(Attachment A)**.

Ms. Young and I went back on Wednesday, March 23, 2016 to see that the spent aerosol cans had been moved to the universal waste SAA near the Valve Shop. Photographs were taken by Ms. Cobb of the cleaned up areas **(Attachment B12, B13)**.

In front of the Valve Shop, DTSC Scientists observed the SAA #10 and #11 containing two 55-gallon drums. The first drum (Satellite #11) had a Hazardous Waste label identifying the contents as contaminated personal protective equipment (PPE), a one year satellite storage label identifying the contents as spent aerosol cans with a start accumulation date of 3/8/16, an in house typed label identifying the contents of contaminated PPE, and lastly an in house typed label identifying the contents as aerosol cans. Due to incorrect in house labeling there was both universal waste and contaminated PPE inside of the drum.

The second drum (Satellite #10) had a Universal Waste label identifying the contents as aerosol cans, a one year satellite storage label identifying the contents as contaminated PPE with a start accumulation date of 3/6/16, a spray-painted label identifying the contents as spent aerosol cans, and an in house typed label identifying the contents of contaminated PPE. DTSC scientists discussed this issue with the facility representatives as an issue of concern.

TN:smk
TN04b.0716

For reference to this issue of concern, see the Discussion with Operator, Section VIII, of this inspection report.

A picture was taken of the mislabeled SAA on Tuesday, March 22, 2016, **(Attachment B14)**. DTSC scientists observed the corrected SAA labels on Wednesday, March 23, 2016. Ms. Cobb took a photograph of the corrected area on March 24, 2016, **(Attachment B15)**.

After inspecting these areas, Ms. Young decided to conclude the inspection for the day. We thanked the P66W personnel and informed them that Ms. Young and I would return in the morning to conduct the rest of the inspection. Ms. Durand would not be joining us the second day due to other obligations. At the end of the day, Ms. Young, Ms. Durand, and I went over notes, had discussion about any places of interest we needed to recheck, and left the facility.

Wednesday, March 23, 2016

On Wednesday, March 23, 2016, at 8:30am, Ms. Young and I arrived at P66W. We discussed our inspection plan, gathered our inspection gear, and checked in with security. We then met Ms. Cobb and Mr. Matthews in front of the security building and they escorted us back into the facility to finish the inspection.

Analytic Lab

Mr. Matthews and Ms. Cobb escorted Ms. Young and I to the Lab building. We were introduced to Mr. Mark Allen (Analytic Lab Director). Mr. Allen gave us a tour of the Analytic lab. Ms. Young checked a fire extinguisher and observed the last inspection date to be 2/16/16. Ms. Young informed the facility representatives that the fire extinguisher would need to be inspected by the facility before the end of the month of March. Ms. Young also observed an emergency shower and eye wash station with an inspection date of 3/17/16.

No issues of concern were observed at the time of the inspection.

Inspection Lab

After observing the Analytic lab, Mr. Allen escorted us to the Inspection Lab where we were introduced to Mr. Manual Perez (Inspection Lab Supervisor). We observed the Inspection lab and the SAA located outside of the building. The SAA was a 55-gallon metal drum labeled as hazardous waste containing lab waste, with a start accumulation date of 3/22/16.

No issues of concern were observed at the time of the inspection.

We then had a lunch break in the P66W cafeteria. After Lunch, we rechecked the Grit Blasting area, observed the Scrap yard, rechecked the ORU, rechecked the Hazardous Waste Accumulation eyewash, and finished with document review of Weekly Inspections and training records.

Scrap Yard

Mr. Matthews and Ms. Cobb escorted Ms. Young and I to the scrap yard. We observed the scrap yard to only have metal scraps and no hazardous material or waste.

No issues of concern were observed at the time of the inspection.

VI. VIOLATIONS

	Yes	No
Summary of Violations attached?	X	___

You must correct the following Class 2 violation(s) within the specified time frame for each violation.

1. Phillips66 Los Angeles Refinery Wilmington (P66W) violated the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66262.11 in that on or about March 22, 2016, P66W failed to determine if waste is hazardous by exclusion from, regulation, testing the waste according to acceptable methods, or applying knowledge of the hazard characteristic.

   To wit:
   (1) DTSC scientists observed a blue 55-gallon metal drum while inspecting the Sulfur Plant. DTSC scientists confirmed that it was a one bolt ring, sealed, not labeled, plastic lined drum with unknown contents. Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66262.11, P66W shall make a determination if waste is hazardous by exclusion from, regulation, testing the waste according to acceptable methods, or applying knowledge of the hazard characteristic.

   (2) In the ORU, DTSC scientists observed a bag of used PPE, a folded blue tarp, a non-legible labeled 2.5-gallon plastic jug with an unknown metallic liquid, two white 5-gallon buckets with black lids containing unknown contents, and one open 5-gallon black bucket containing unknown contents. Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66262.11, P66W shall determine if waste is hazardous by exclusion from, regulation, testing the waste according to acceptable methods, or applying knowledge of the hazard characteristic.

Corrective Action:
(1) P66W shall make a hazardous waste determination. On Wednesday, March 23, 2016, DTSC scientists reviewed the MSDS and manifests for the shipment of the 55-gallon drum to be refractory brick, non-RCRA hazardous waste, solid, contaminated debris.

(2) P66W personnel removed the trash, cleaned the area where the trash had been, and put the trash into the ongoing refinery clean up bin for oily metals. DTSC scientists observed the ORU area to be in compliance before leaving the facility.

2. Phillips66 Los Angeles Refinery Wilmington (P66W) violated the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66262.34(a)(3) in that on or about March 22, 2016, P66W failed to mark or label each hazardous waste container used for onsite accumulation.

   To wit:
   (1) DTSC scientists observed a metal 55-gallon, one bolt ring, sealed, not labeled, plastic lined drum with unknown contents while inspecting the sulfur plant. Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66262.34(a) (3), P66W shall label each hazardous waste container used for onsite accumulation.

   (2) In the ORU, DTSC scientists observed a bag of used PPE, a folded blue tarp, a non-legible labeled 2.5-gallon plastic jug with an unknown metallic liquid, two white unlabeled 5-gallon buckets with black lids containing unknown contents, and one open unlabeled 5-gallon black bucket containing unknown contents. Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66262.34(a) (3), P66W shall label each hazardous waste container used for onsite accumulation.

   Corrective Action:
   (1) P66W shall label each hazardous waste container used for onsite accumulation. On Wednesday, March 23, 2016, DTSC scientists reviewed the MSDS and manifests of the 55-gallon drum to be refractory brick, non-RCRA hazardous waste, solid, contaminated debris. The drum was shipped off that day.
   (2) P66W shall label each hazardous waste container used for onsite accumulation. P66W personnel removed the trash, cleaned the area where the trash had been, and put the trash into the ongoing refinery clean up bin for oily metals. DTSC scientists observed the ORU area to be in compliance before leaving the facility

3. Phillips66 Los Angeles Refinery Wilmington (P66W) violated the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66262.34(a) (2) in that on or about

March 22, 2016, P66W failed to mark each container with the date upon which the contents had become a waste.

To wit:
(1) DTSC scientists observed a metal 55-gallon, one bolt ring, sealed, not labeled, plastic lined drum with unknown contents in the sulfur plant. Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66262.34(a) (2), P66W shall label each container with the date upon which the contents had become a waste.

(2) In the ORU, DTSC scientists observed a bag of used PPE, a folded blue tarp, a non-legible labeled 2.5-gallon plastic jug with an unknown metallic liquid, two white 5-gallon buckets with black lids containing unknown contents, and one open 5-gallon black bucket containing unknown contents. None of these containers stated the date upon which the contents had become a waste. Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66262.34(a) (2), P66W shall label each container with the date upon which the contents had become a waste.

Corrective Action:
(1) P66W shall label each hazardous was container used for onsite accumulation with an accumulation date which the contents had become a waste. On Wednesday, March 23, 2016, DTSC scientists reviewed the MSDS and manifests of the 55-gallon drum to be refractory brick, non-RCRA hazardous waste, solid, contaminated debris. The drum was shipped off that day.

(2) P66W shall label each hazardous was container used for onsite accumulation with an accumulation date which the contents had become a waste. P66W personnel removed the trash, cleaned the area where the trash had been, and put the trash into the ongoing refinery clean up bin for oily metals. DTSC scientists observed the ORU area to be in compliance before leaving the facility.

The following minor violation(s) were noted and corrected during the inspection, and no further action is required:

1. Phillips66 Los Angeles Refinery Wilmington (P66W) violated the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66265.34(a)(4) and 66265.33 in that on or about March 22, 2016, P66W failed to assure proper operation of an emergency eye wash station.

   To wit: DTSC scientists observed the eye wash station located in the Hazardous Waste Accumulation Area to not have adequate pressure due to a carbon build up. Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, Title 22,

Section 66265.34(a) (4) and 66265.33, proper operation of an emergency eye wash station shall be assured.

Corrective Action: P66W shall test and maintain emergency equipment as necessary to assure its proper operation in the time of emergency. On March 23, 2016, P66W staff put in a work request and the issue was resolved. DTSC scientists observed the eye wash station to be functioning properly.

2. P66W violated the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66265.173(a) in that on or about March 22, 2016, P66W failed to properly close a hazardous waste container near the Oil Refining Unit (ORU).

   To wit: In the ORU, DTSC scientists observed an unattended, open hazardous waste container containing solids and debris from tank 198. Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66265.173(a), hazardous waste containers shall be closed at all times except when adding or removing hazardous waste.

   Corrective Action: P66W shall immediately properly close and secure all hazardous waste containers while not actively in the process of adding or removing waste. P66W staff promptly closed the drum by replacing the ring. DTSC scientists were able to observe the closed drum before leaving the facility. A new lid was ordered and was placed onto the drum on April 6, 2016.

3. P66W violated the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66273.35(b) in that on or about March 22, 2016, P66W failed to demonstrate the length of time universal waste has been accumulated from the date it became a waste.

   To wit: In the Grit blasting area, DTSC scientists observed two small buckets containing approximately eight spent aerosol cans. These containers were not properly labeled with the start accumulation date. Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66273.35(b), demonstration of the length of time the universal waste has been accumulated from the date it became a waste must be demonstrated.

   Corrective Action: P66W shall immediately place the spent aerosol cans in properly labeled containers with a start accumulation date. P66W staff moved the spent aerosol cans to the designated Satellite Accumulation Area for Universal Waste – spent aerosol cans. DTSC scientists observed the area to be in compliance before leaving the facility.

4. P66W violated the Health and Safety Code, Section 25201.16(f)(1)(A) in that on or about March 22, 2016, P66W failed to store universal waste – spent aerosol cans in a closed container.

TN:smk
TN04b.0716

To wit: In the Grit Blasting area, DTSC scientists observed two open plastic containers containing eight spent aerosol cans. Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 25201.16(f) (1) (A), universal waste – spent aerosol can shall be stored in a closed container.

Corrective Action: P66W shall immediately store all universal waste in proper containers. P66W promptly moved the spent aerosol cans to the nearby universal waste SAA. DTSC scientists observed the area to be in compliance before leaving the facility.

5. P66W violated the Health and Safety Code, Section 25201.16(f)(6) in that on or about March 22, 2016, P66W failed to label a container used to hold universal waste with one of the following phrases: "Universal Waste – Aerosol Cans", "Waste Aerosol Cans", or "Used Aerosol Cans".

   To wit: In the Grit Blasting area, DTSC scientists observed two unlabeled, open plastic containers containing eight spent aerosol cans. Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 25201.16(f)(6), containers holding universal waste – aerosol cans shall be labeled with one of the following phrases: "Universal Waste – Aerosol Cans", "Waste Aerosol Cans", or "Used Aerosol Cans".

   Corrective Action: P66W shall immediately label containers used to hold universal waste with one of the following phrases: "Universal Waste – Aerosol Cans", "Waste Aerosol Cans", or "Used Aerosol Cans". DTSC scientists observed the area to be in compliance before leaving the facility.

VII. SAMPLING ACTIVITIES

No samples were collected.

VIII. DISCUSSION WITH OPERATOR

The close out meeting was held in the Conference room. Mr. Bekel, Mr. Matthews, Tony Avacoli (Business Team Lead), Ms. Cobb, Ms. Young and I were in attendance. Ms. Young began by thanking the P66W staff for their cooperation during the inspection. We discussed the violations and other issues of concern we observed during the inspection. Ms. Young explained that further research would be needed to determine if the following "other issues of concern" were violations or not.

1. On Tuesday, March 22, 2016, in the Bundle Cleaning Pad area, DTSC Scientists observed a deteriorating back splash netting. Ms. Young discussed

the matter with Ms. Cobb about having the netting replaced. Ms. Cobb said that a replacement back splash netting had already been ordered.

P66W should ensure that the bundle cleaning pad is properly enclosed as to prevent possible releases due to inadequate containment.

2. On Tuesday, March 22, 2016, In front of the Valve Shop, DTSC Scientists observed the SAA #10 and #11 containing two 55-gallon drums. The first drum (Satellite #11) had a Hazardous Waste label identifying the contents as contaminated personal protective equipment (PPE), a one year satellite storage label identifying the contents as spent aerosol cans with a start accumulation date of 3/8/16, an in house typed label identifying the contents of contaminated PPE, and lastly an in house typed label identifying the contents as aerosol cans. Due to incorrect in house labeling there was both universal waste and contaminated PPE inside of the drum.

   The second drum (Satellite #10) had a Universal Waste label identifying the contents as aerosol cans, a one year satellite storage label identifying the contents as contaminated PPE with a start accumulation date of 3/6/16, a spray- painted label identifying the contents as spent aerosol cans, and an in house typed label identifying the contents of contaminated PPE.

   DTSC scientists discussed this issue with the facility representatives. P66W should ensure that the in house labeling is in agreement with the hazardous waste or universal waste labeling indicated on the SSAs throughout the facility.

Ms. Young issued a Summary of Observation (SOO) checking the box on the SOO that indicates further investigation would be necessary to confirm violations. Ms. Young signed the SOO then asked Mr. Matthews to sign and make a copy for themselves. Ms. Cobb made a copy of the SOO. She also provided Ms. Young with a CD of photographs taken during the inspection. See the SOO, **(Attachment D)**.

We thanked them again for their time, and left the facility.

IX. ATTACHMENTS

A. Summary of Violations, 8 pages
B. Inspection Photographs, 15 pages
C. MSDS and Manifest, 7 pages
D. Summary of Observations, 1 page

TN:smk
TN04b.0716

Tiffany Nef, Environmental Scientist
Inspector

Original signature by Tiffany Nef

Inspector (Signature)

7/14/16
Date

TN:smk
TN04b.0716